

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 15-52 and 54-59 are pending in the application. Claims 12, 15, 32, 52, 54-56 and 58-59 are currently being examined. Claims 1-11, 16-31, 33-51 and 57 have been withdrawn

I. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 12, 15, 32, 52, 54-56, 58 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. It is alleged that the amendment of claims 12, 58 and 59 to recite “heterologous recombinant class II molecules” is not supported in the specification in that it does not provide support for the term “heterologous” and do not disclose any aspect that relates to MHC class II molecules. Office Action, page 3. Applicants traverse.

To satisfy the written description requirement, a patent specification must describe the claimed invention in sufficient detail that one skilled in the art can reasonably conclude that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. See, e.g., *Moba, B.V. v. Diamond Automation, Inc.*, 325 F.3d 1306, 1319, 66 USPQ2d 1429, 1438 (Fed. Cir. 2003). An applicant complies with the written description requirement “by describing the invention, with all its claimed limitations, not that which make it obvious,” and by using “such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc. that set forth the claimed invention”. *Regents of California v. Eli Lilly & Co.*, 119 F.3d 1559, 1666 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

Written description for the amendment of claims 12, 58 and 59 are found in the specification on pages 13 and 14, *inter alia*. Specifically, page 13 of the specification discloses that “[t]he vesicles of the invention may comprise one or more other, heterologous, molecules of interest, in addition to or instead of the above-mentioned MHC complexes.” Specification, page 13, lines 25-28. Further, page 14 of the specification discloses “[t]he term “heterologous” indicates that the molecule of interest is not present, in this form, in the exosomes of the invention in their natural state.” Specification, page 14, lines 8-11. Finally, page 14 discloses that “preferred types of molecules of interest are especially MHC molecules.” Specification, page 14, lines 19-20.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that any rejections of claims 12, 15, 32, 52, 54-56, 58 and 59 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicants have properly and fully addressed each of the Examiner's grounds for rejection. Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes further discussion will aid examination and advance prosecution of the application, a telephone call to the undersigned is invited. If there are any additional fees due in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the fees to undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-1067. If any extensions or fees are not accounted for, such extension is requested and the associated fee should be charged to our deposit account.

Respectfully Submitted,

April 27, 2006



Don J. Peltz
Reg. No. 33,754

Preston Gates Ellis & Rouvelas Meeds LLP
1735 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 500
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 628-1700
Facsimile: (202) 331-1024